PART A – COVER PAGE

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD
SFY 2002 Costa-Machado Water Act of 2000
Chapter 6, Article 2, Watershed Protection Program and Chapter 7, Article 2, Nonpoint Source Control Program

Application Number: 540

Project Region: CVRW QCG — Indicate RWQCB #: 5
Multi-regional Project: ____ — Indicate RWQCB #s: ____
Statewide Project: ____

PROJECT TITLE: Colfax Community Watershed and Fire Safe Ecosystem Project Summary

PROJECT DIRECTOR (one name only): Mr., Bob Perrault — June 7, 2002
PRINT — DATE

LEAD APPLICANT OR ORGANIZATION: City of Colfax

TYPE OF AGENCY:

Municipality: yes — Local Agency: ____ — *Nonprofit (non-landowner): ____

Nonprofit (landowner): ____ — Local Public Agency: ____

STREET ADDRESS: 33 S. Main St.
CITY: Colfax — Zip Code: 95713
P.O. BOX: ____ — Zip Code: ____
COUNTY: Placer County
STATE: CA

PHONE NO.: 530-346-2313 FAX NO.: 530-346-6214

E-MAIL ADDRESS: Colfax@foothill.net

FEDERAL TAX ID. NO.: 94-6000313

PROJECT TYPE: 4,5,6,8

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

Senate District 1

Assembly District 4

United States Congressional District 4

RWQCB or SWRCB STAFF CONTACTED REGARDING THIS PROPOSAL:

RWQCB Contact:	Lori Webber	SWRCB Contact:	B.G. Tackett
Phone No.:	916-255-0745	Phone No.:	916-322-3052
Dates contacted:	6/5/02, 6/6/02	Dates contacted:	6/5/02

COOPERATING ENTITIES:

Entity Name: American River Watershed Institute
Role/Contribution to Project: Consultant
Contact Person: Otis Wollan Phone No.: 530-320-6841
E-mail address: otis@foothill.net

Entity Name: Greater Colfax Area Fire Safe Council
Role/Contribution to Project: Advisory
Contact Person: Robin Yonash Phone No.: 530-346-6037
E-mail address: ryonash@infostations.com

WATERBODY/WATERSHED (Include Catalog Number in Section 18 of the ARD): Upper Bear River (18020126)
North Fork American River (180020128)

GPS COORDINATES FOR PROJECT LOCATION, IF AVAILABLE:

FISCAL SUMMARY:

Proposition 13 Funds Requested	$99,700
Other Project Funds	$28,150
Total Project Budget	$127,850

CERTIFICATION

Please read before signing.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the information I have entered on this application is true and complete to the best of my knowledge and that I am entitled to submit the application on behalf of the applicant (if the applicant is an entity/organization). I further understand that any false, incomplete, or incorrect statements may result in the disqualification of this application. By signing this application, I waive any and all rights to privacy and confidentiality of the proposal on behalf of the applicant, to the extent provided in this RFP.

Applicant Signature Date

Printed Name of Applicant

PART B – PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK (Part B not to exceed 5 pages)

BACKGROUND AND GOALS

The Context. The City of Colfax is located at approximately 2500 feet elevation in the Sierra Nevada foothills on the Route 80 corridor northeast of Sacramento; the City area includes both the American River Watershed and the Bear River Watershed, since the City was built on the ridgetop along the railroad line in the 1860's.

A primary threat to the City and its surrounding environment is catastrophic fire. This focus on fire threat reduction, with its consequent negative effect on water quality, has also been adopted by the American River Watershed Group in its assessment and planning approach to the full 960 square mile American River Watershed. The problem of excessive fuel loads in the ecosystem is a result of management practices from forest harvest, land use activities, grazing, and the like, combined with a management approach that stressed fire suppression and removal of fire cycles from the ecosystem. Gradual fuel loading and regular fire cycles are a natural feature of our Mediterranean climate; a management approach to fire that goes beyond fire suppression for protection of the economic, social, and environmental values of this community and its surroundings is not currently in place.

The Ponderosa Fire (6000+acres in 2001) demonstrated this threat and the management challenge in a compelling manner. The fire spread rapidly and raced out of the American River canyon up ravines (also referred to as fire chimneys) toward the City and its surroundings. A single shaded fuel break on one forest landowner's property was rapidly extended by CDF firefighters, and is credited with preventing the fire's advance into the City area itself. This shaded fuel break has been profiled and celebrated in story and poster format by CDF. This experience made it clear that a more extensive forward-looking fire and vegetation management plan is needed to prevent catastrophic to the community and its environment.

The City has entered into a series of partnerships with community groups, community members, and other jurisdictions to create this plan and demonstrate its viability through this Proposition 13 grant opportunity. The principle partners in this grant are: the City of Colfax, the Greater Colfax Area Fire Safe Council, Placer Hills Fire Safe Council, Alta Fire Safe Council, American River Watershed Group, and the American River Watershed Institute.

The Purpose, Duration and Outcome. The purpose of the grant is to fund an on-the-ground demonstration shaded fuel break in a community that has been planned and analyzed from an ecosystem and watershed perspective. The demonstration will be planned using as one of the GIS layers for analysis the Ecological Unit Inventory (EUI) for the area. The American River Watershed area will have the EUI layer created in a current CALFED grant; this grant will fund the EUI inventory in the adjacent Bear River Watershed area in order to complete the EUI inventory for the Fire Safe Councils. The duration of the grant is Fall 2003 through Spring 2006, allowing two seasons of monitoring impacts of erosion and/or water quality impacts. The outcomes will be:

- An on-the-ground shaded fuel break capital project integrating an Ecological Unit Inventory watershed planning approach
- Completion of the EUI GIS layer for the project area for use in the planning phase,
- A community area/watershed area plan for integrating a shaded fuel break for the Colfax area that can move toward watershed and ecosystem enhancement by exploring the best management practice of natural fire cycle accommodation as a principle maintenance strategy.
- A monitoring and education component overseen by the American River Watershed Institute to ensure assessment of water quality conditions and assess the impact on the health of the watershed, and including outreach and information to the community through ARWI's ongoing watershed education and research program.

Relation of project goals to funding requirements, and goals of CALFED and CVRWQCB. Colfax is a named qualifying small municipality in the RFP. This project addresses the requirements of the Watershed Protection Program in Section 15 of the Act, and is consistent with CALFED and RWQCB goals, by:

- Colfax has the legal authority to manage the grant, and is a signatory to the MOU of the American River Watershed Group.
- GIS systems will be used to display and manage the data, and provide analysis, as overseen by the American River Watershed Institute and Placer County Resource Conservation District in their role as host to the American River Regional GIS Center.
- Support the local community institutional capacity to restore the watershed through the completion of the EUI watershed shaded fuel break plan that attempts to demonstrate how fire or fire-replicating best management practices can allow accommodation of the fire cycle into ecosystem management; this addresses the root cause, not the symptom, of mid-elevation Mediterranean climate fuel loading in the ecosystem. Completion of the EUI for the Bear River portions of the project planning area will allow the Colfax area planning approach to be replicated in adjacent communities, complementing the existing CALFED EUI grant for an American River Watershed Plan, the CALFED Sedimentation Management Assessment and Planning grant for the American River, and supplementing

the National Fire Plan grant for Community Fire Safe Plans with an on-the-ground capital project component. The planning process for this capital project is also occurring concurrently with the Weimar-Applegate-Colfax Municipal Advisory Committee (WACMAC) Community Plan Update, part of the General Plan process; WACMAC has stated that it intends for fire issues, including vegetation management, to be addressed in all elements of the updated Community Plan.

- Local stakeholder input will be fundamental to the project, and will be facilitated by the American River Watershed Institute in conjunction with the Fire Safe Council, the American River Watershed Group, and the Placer County Fire Safe Alliance. Additionally, the proposed project was reviewed by the Colfax City Council in two study sessions in 2002, and has been reviewed by the County Executive Officer and two County Supervisors.
- The project will focus on evaluating impacts from implementation of pilot project segments of the planned network of shaded fuel breaks designed through a watershed/EUI planning approach, reviewed by agencies and stakeholders, and using the ecosystem design principles, and filtered by established stakeholder forums as well as traditional environmental review in the CEQA process. The core and single greatest expense of the proposal is the on-the-ground capital investment; the network of shaded fuel breaks at the urban/wildland interface are a planned community infrastructure that may enable accommodation of a natural wildland fire cycle, thus enhancing the water quality and ecosystem health by preventing catastrophic fuel loading while protecting socio-economic value.
- The citizen-monitoring component, which will be part of the monitoring plan (Task 5.6) may address baseline water quality focusing on sediment and erosion impacts from the project areas as well as monitoring exotic vegetation species introduction; all elements will be integral with, complement and enhance the education and research programs of the American River Watershed Institute, which has signed the QAPP in cooperation with the SWRCB Clean Water Team. ARWI has also received a 319(h) grant which includes rapid bio-assessment trainings for citizen-monitors.
- Upper Bear River (18020126) and North Fork American River (18020128) are UWA Category I listed watersheds.
- Desired future conditions will be combined with the EUI approach which includes potential natural vegetation, and economic benefits and costs of the targeted areas will be considered. The objective will be to improve the environment through a fire management strategy that does not degrade water quality through sedimentation impacts, either through project implementation or the long term goal of accommodation of fire cycle (or an equivalent practice that mimics fire's effects) into the ecosystem that will help protect the nearly intact watersheds of mid and upper Sierran elevations

2. PROPOSED WORK TO BE PERFORMED

Task 4 Complete Ecological Unit Inventory (EUI) for Project Planning Area.

An EUI is being completed for the American River Watershed through a CALFED grant to the Placer County Resource Conservation District (PCRCD). The project area defined in this grant is the three Fire Safe Councils specified--- Greater Colfax Area Fire Safe Council, Placer Hills Fire Safe Council, and Alta Fire Safe Council. These Fire Safe Councils span the I-80 corridor ridge that runs from American River to Bear River. The EUI analysis is needed for that part of the project that is outside the American River Watershed, within the boundary of the three Councils and in the Bear River Watershed. The same contractor used in the PCRCD grant will be utilized for the enlarged analysis area; Adaptive Management Services, a USFS Enterprise Team, was named in the PCRCD/CALFED grant as subcontractor for EUI services.

4.1 Obtain geo-rectified aerial photographic GIS layer from Placer County Planning Department. High resolution aerial color photos have been taken for the Planning Department, which intends to digitize the photos within the next year.

4.2 Conduct EUI analysis on project area. Analysis will be conducted in collaboration with the PCRCD/CALFED EUI analysis, which includes a technical advisory committee, and a policy advisory team. No separate TAC or advisory panel will be needed for this project.

Deliverables: 4.1 GIS layer created of aerial photos; 4.2 EUI analysis completed for study area

Task 5 Plan integrated network of shaded fuel breaks; plan specific pilot capital project area to be implemented.

5.1 Conduct minimum of six meetings with Greater Cofax Fire Safe Council, Placer Hills Fire Safe Council, Alta Fire Safe Council, CDF, Placer Hills Fire District, and Placer County Fire Safe Alliance to establish design parameters and potential locations for shaded fuel break network in the project area.

5.2 Conduct direct contact with landowners in potential project area site to assess potential levels of participation.

5.3 Initiate cooperative dialogue sessions (the Fire Safe Council "Coffee Klatch" program, minimum of 6) with potential cooperators to assess condition and refine shaded fuel break design parameters for specific community conditions.

5.4 Consult with EUI Contractor to assess ecological elements for the project plan, and with CDF to ensure support of project design alternatives.

5.5 Conduct stakeholder outreach to ensure plan is consistent with area stakeholders. Bring project plan before the American River Watershed Group (ARWG) for consideration and refinement (this project proposal has been accepted by ARWG as part of its CALFED Category III funded Watershed Strategy and Plan. Bring project plan before Weimar-Applegate-Colfax Municipal Advisory Committee and Colfax City Council study session. Present to Placer County Fire Safe Alliance, and three Fire Safe Councils.

5.6 Prepare final project plan and monitoring plan in cooperation with Registered Professional Forester. Include design for monitoring as appropriate, which will include photo-monitoring, and might include sediment monitoring and/or rapid bio-assessment and/or terrestrial and amphibian monitoring and/or physical and/or chemical monitoring as site conditions warrant.

5.7 Obtain written permission and commitment from all landowners involved in the pilot capital project area.

5.8 Conduct at least four Fire Safe Council and neighborhood meetings to ensure concurrence with final project plan.

Deliverables: 5.1 meeting minutes; 5.2 record of mailing; 5.3 meeting minutes and assessment; 5.4 meeting minutes; 5.5 meeting minutes; 5.6 construction plan document draft and final, monitoring plan specific to site; 5.7 landowners letters of agreement; 5.8 meeting minutes

Task 6 Conduct pre-project monitoring

6.1. Conduct Photo-monitoring to inventory existing conditions before construction.

6.2 Conduct selected monitoring methodology as appropriate.(see Task 5.6)

Deliverables: 6.1 photo inventory; 6.2 monitoring reports

Task 7 Capital pilot project implementation. Build the Shaded Fuel Break(s).

7.1 Conduct safety instruction and methods instruction for those landowners or others who participate on a volunteer basis as matching labor to the contract, and who will be working in coordination with the contractor. Methods instruction will be based on PCRCD's ***[Fuel Reduction Manual].***

7.2 Construct the shaded fuel break(s) or break segments. Depending on site conditions and the design criteria, construction can be accomplished by masticators, tree thinning and/or harvest methods, chipping, burning, or by utilizing hand clearing methodologies.

7.3 Provide construction oversight and inspection services by Registered Professional Forester and staff to ensure quality work; photo-document construction

7.4 Develop "as constructed" drawings at the end of shaded fuel break construction. Develop GIS layer updating the PCRCD Regional GIS Data Base for fire safe projects completed.

7.5 Conduct post-construction photo-monitoring.

Deliverables: 7.1 sign in sheets; 7.2 acres of shaded fuel break as determined by project plan; 7.3 photo documentation of construction; 7.4 set of drawings and GIS layer; 7.5 photo inventory

Task 8. Post project evaluation, education, and outreach.

8.1 Conduct appropriate post-construction monitoring as per monitoring plan (see Task 5.6).

8.2 Evaluate project results from monitoring and construction report with CDF, Fire Safe Councils, Placer Fire Safe Alliance, and the American River Watershed Group.

8.3 Prepare a report for publication and for presentation profiling project, including the evaluation and assessment by the stakeholder groups mentioned in Task 8.2. Print report for distribution, including to local schools.

8.4 Present report to City Council of Colfax, and Weimar Applegate Colfax Municipal Advisory Council.

8.5 Conduct media tour of site, prepare press release, publicizing project success and availability of the project publication prepared in Task 8.3.

Deliverables: 8.1 monitoring reports; 8.2 meeting minutes; 8.3 publication prepared and printed, presentation prepared; 8.4 meeting notes; 8.5 press release, media tour event by photo record and notes

Task 9. Draft and Final Report

9.1 Prepare a draft report including task products. The report shall include the following narrative sections:

a. A brief introduction section including a statement of purpose, the scope of the project, and a description of the approach and techniques used during the project.

b. A list of task products previously submitted as outlined in the Schedule of Completion.

c. Any additional information that is deemed appropriate by the Project Director.

d. Indicate whether the purposes of the project have been met. Include information collected in accordance with the Project Assessment and Evaluation Plan, including a determination of the effectiveness of the best management practices or management measures implemented as pat of the project in preventing or reducing nonpoint source pollution.

9.2 Submit copies of report to Contract Manager for review and comment.

9.3 Prepare a final report that addresses, to the extent feasible, comments made by Contract Manager on the draft report. Submit one reproducible master and 2 copies of the final project report to the Contract Manager for review and acceptance.

Deliverables: 9.1 draft report produced; 9.2 copies sent; 9.3 final report produced

TARGET COMPLETION DATES

Task No. Deliverables	Target Completion Dates
Task 1: Project Administration	
1.2 Quarterly/Monthly Progress Reports	*6/30/06*
1.5 Contract Summary Form	*12/30/03*
1.6 List of subcontracted tasks, Good Faith Effort documents, quarterly/monthly Utilization Reports	
1.7 Subcontractor Documentation	*6/30/06*
1.8 Expenditure/Invoice Projections	*6/30/06*
1.9 Project Survey Form	*6/30/06*
Task 2: CEQA/NEPA Documents and Permits, if applicable	
2.1 CEQA Documentation	9/30/04
2.2 Permits	9/30/04
Task 3: Quality Assurance Project Plan Training	QAPP for ARWI in SWRCB file;
Task 4: Complete Ecological Unit Inventory	
4.1 Obtain geo-rectified aerial photographs	10/30/03
4.2 Conduct EUI analysis on Bear R WS lands	10/30/04
Task 5:Plan Shaded Fuel Break Network	
5.1 Conduct outreach meetings to establish design parameters	11/30/04
5.2 Contact landowners in site areas	11/30/03
5.3 Initiate assessment and design meetings with cooperators	1/30/04
5.4 Consult with EUI contractor and CDF	2/28/04
5.5 Conduct stakeholder outreach/concurrence	2/28/04
5.6 Prepare draft project plan	4/30/04
5.7 Obtain permissions from landowners	6/30/04
5.8 Conduct neighborhood/FSC meetings to concur	9/30/04
Task 6: Conduct pre-project monitoring	
6.1 Conduct photo-monitoring	10/30/04
6.2 Conduct monitoring	2/30/05
Task 7: Capital pilot project implementation	
7.1 Conduct safety instruction for volunteers	5/30/05
7.2 Construct shaded fuel break	11/30/05
7.3 Provide construction inspection	11/30/05
7.4 Develop “as constructed” drawings	12/30/05
7.5 Conduct post-construction photo-monitoring	11/30/05
Task 8: Post project evaluation, education & outreach	
8.1 Conduct appropriate post-construction monitoring	2/15/06
8.2 Evaluate project & monitoring results	3/15/06
8.3 Prepare report for local publication	4/30/06
8.4 Report to City and WACMAC	4/30/06
8.5 Conduct media tour of site; prepare press release	4/30/06
Task 9: Draft and Final Reports	
9.1 Draft Report	5/7/06
9.2 Submit for review and comment	5/7/06
9.3 Final Report	5/30/06

PART C1 - BUDGET SUMMARY SHEET – TASK BUDGET BREAKDOWN (Parts C1 and C2 combined not to exceed 2 pages)

	Proposition 13 Funds	Other Project Funds	Total Budget
1. Task 1 – Project Administration	$7300	$0	$7300
2. Task 2 – CEQA/NEPA Documents and Permits	$7500	$0	$7500
3. Task 3 – Quality Assurance Project Plan -SWRCB file ARWI	0	0	0
4. Task 4 – EUI Analysis	$15,000	$15,000	$30,000
5. Task 5 – Create Fuel Break Plan	$15,000	$4650	$19,650
6. Task 6 – Pre-project Monitoring	$2700	0	$2700
7. Task 7 – Construct Capital Project	$37,000	$7500	$44,500
8. Task 8 – Evaluation and Outreach	$10,200	$900	$11,100
9. Task 9 -- Draft and Final Reports	$5000	$100	$5100
TOTAL BUDGET	$99,700	$28,150	$127,850

PART C2 - BUDGET SUMMARY SHEET – LINE ITEM Budget (Parts C1 and C2 combined not to exceed 2 pages)

	Proposition 13 Funds	Other Project Funds	Total Budget
1. Personnel Services	$9,200	$5,550	$14,750
2. Operating Expenses	$1,400	$100	$1,500
3. Property Acquisitions			
a. Equipment			
b. Furniture			
c. Portable assets			
d. Electronic data software/hardware			
e. Processing equipment			
f. Miscellaneous			
4. Professional and Consultant Services	$58,100	$15,000	$73,100
5. Contract Laboratory Services	$1,000		$1,000
6. Construction Expenses	$30,000	$7,500	$37,500
7. General Overhead			
8. TOTAL BUDGET	$99,700	$28,150	$127,850

9. Describe the source and nature of the matching funds.

Matching funds in Task 3 consist of inkind $15,000 contribution from Placer County Planning Department for the geo-rectification of the aerial photographs of the project area. The aerial photographs have been taken. In order to be useful for the Ecological Unit Inventory, the photographs need to be geo-rectified in a GIS projection.

Matching funds in Task 5 and Task 8 are derived from the volunteer participation of stakeholders in the various consensus processes. The number of hours per meeting is multiplied by the average number of participants at the meeting, then multiplied by $15/hour as an average volunteer rate. The average number of participants at the meeting is estimated from an historical record; all of the groups mentioned are ongoing, including the Fire Safe Councils, the Fire Safe Alliance, the American River Watershed Group, and the “coffee klatch” program.

Matching funds in Task 7 are actual volunteer participation in the construction of the shaded fuel break/fire safe community. Community members will be asked to participate in the construction. The leverage ratio of local participation to granted funds is 1:4, which should be very appealing to the perspective of the community. The community will also be asked to make some commitment to

future maintenance, but none of that conjecture is included in the "match". The assumption is that 500 hours of community participation will occur, at an average of $15/hour, for a matching amount of $7500. Other entities could also participate, including Placer County chipper program, CDF fire crew participation, or Placer County inmate crews.

PART D – QUESTIONNAIRE

The application must follow the format provided in this RFP. The Project Questionnaire (Part D) must include the question number and the associated question. Do not include the explanatory text (shown in italics) provided with the questions. An electronic copy of the application without the explanatory text is available on the website at www.swrcb.ca.gov/prop13/index.html.

1. *Identify, if applicable, the major sources of NPS pollution that will be addressed by the project (check all appropriate sources).*

__ __Agriculture __ **X** __Forestry __ **X** __Urban (Construction, Roads, Septic Systems) ____Stormwater/Urban Runoff
____Marinas and Boating Activities ____Hydromodification
____Resource Extraction Other:_____

2. *Is the proposed project identified in an existing watershed management plan, restoration action strategy, or equivalent document?*

The proposed project was accepted by consensus of the American River Watershed Group on May 31, 2002 as an element of its American River Watershed Stewardship Strategy, which was funded by a CALFED Category III Ecosystem Restoration grant. The Strategy is in draft form, and is scheduled for completion November 30, 2002.

3. *What other restoration or protection actions or projects have been taken previously to implement the document?*

The Stewardship Strategy is in draft status, and no other projects have been undertaken to implement the strategy.

4. *Is this a next-phase of an ongoing project? Yes__ (if "yes," describe) No_**X**_*

5. *Describe how the project will result in ongoing or widespread implementation throughout the project area, region, or state.*

This project will be the first implementation project in an area that has been recently organized in community Fire Safe Councils. Two National Fire Plan grants are currently funding five Community Fire Safe Plans due for completion September 30, 2002. This project directly involves three of the new Fire Safe Councils—Alta Fire Safe Council, Colfax Fire Safe Council, and Placer Hills Fire Safe Council. The added dimension of the Ecological Unit Inventory challenges the Fire Safe planning effort to be fully inclusive of watershed values and ecosystem values.
Perhaps most dynamically, the County General Plan process is just beginning for this area, initiated through Placer County's award winning community planning process. This process started with the formation of the Weimar-Applegate-Colfax Municipal Advisory Committee (WACMAC). As the process began last summer, the county has committed that the fire and fuel reduction issue be included as part of the vegetation element for the community plan. This is the first time where the vegetation issues associated with fire have become a focus of the land-use planning process. Not coincidentally, Robin Yonash, Chair of the Greater Colfax Fire Safe Council, has been appointed by the County Board of Supervisors to serve on the WACMAC.
Further, because the City of Colfax limits are small, collaboration with Placer County and the WACMAC Community Planning process are essential. Broader fire safety for the city will only occur in the wider community, regulated by the County.
Thus, this proposed project is located in the geographic and political center of four innovative planning processes:

1. The American River Watershed Group Watershed Stewardship planning process (and because the project area spans two watersheds, the Bear River Watershed Group's watershed planning process),
2. The Community Fire Safe Council planning process for three councils,
3. The land use county planning process of the Weimar-Applegate-Colfax Municipal Advisory Council to the Placer County General Plan, and
4. The City-County collaborative to address fire safety on a community-wide basis from a watershed and ecosystem perspective.

6. *Describe related anticipated future work in the affected watershed.*

The I-80 Corridor is the most populated area of the Sierra Nevada, with a chain of population centers along the freeway from Sacramento to Alta (elevation 3000 ft.). On either side of the freeway corridor are steep wildland canyons. The urban-wildland interface is very pronounced and abrupt, with no transition zone. The natural cycle of fire in the Sierra Foothill ecosystem cannot be suppressed; suppression efforts have delayed the inevitable conflagration. We are at a

point in history to a point where fuel loading in all biomes from chaparral to blue oak woodland to mixed conifer is dangerous to the extreme.

These communities and the regulating agencies are awakening to this hazardous condition. Cooperative ventures are emerging to address the vital need to defend water quality by defending communities from fire. A Comprehensive Canyonland Fire Plan was initiated for the Auburn State Recreation Area by BLM, BOR, CDF, and State Parks in the Fall of 2001 as a result of three catastrophic fires in the region. Auburn Fire Department and Auburn City Council (with collaborative demonstration projects funded by the American River Watershed Group) engaged in a joint effort with the State/Federal Canyonland group to plan a fuel break next to the City of Auburn.

The City of Colfax and the network of participants in the six community Fire Safe Councils anticipate a comprehensive planning process over the coming decade for the entire area that will include fire safety in the urban zones, shaded fuel break strategies for the urban/wildland interface, and accommodation of the natural fire cycle in the wildland areas. This means that the entire I-80 corridor will be addressing the issue of a network of shaded fuel breaks, and our relationship to fire safety, land use planning, and watershed planning. We anticipate the issue will become even more heated as the insurance companies focus on the dangers, as they have begun to do. We believe that the I-80 corridor has the assets at risk, the greatest concentration of population, the financial and human resources, the agency awareness, and the infrastructure to undertake the challenge first and most comprehensively for the Sierra Nevada as a whole. The Colfax area is the ideal location for a pilot that is inclusive of the complex multi-layers of planning processes, agencies, and community interests that will be addressing these issues and processes. .

7. *Will the proposed project achieve measurable water quality improvements?*

The answer to this question is in two general categories: first, the near term water quality effects of shaded fuel breaks, and second, the very broad and long term effects of bringing the Sierra Foothill ecosystem back into balance with the natural fire cycle.

The near term water quality effects will be measured according to the monitoring plan which will be developed in Task 5.6. Appropriate monitoring methodologies will be developed, depending on soil erosion potential, whether the fuel break is in proximity to or crosses a stream, vegetation types, habitat impacts, and the like.

The second and broader aspect of this question goes to the question of ecosystem balance with the fire cycle in the Sierra Foothills. The greatest threat to water quality is the imbalance of the ecosystem in relation to the natural fire cycle. When the fire cycle is delayed by suppression, the fuel loading increases to the point where any fire is a catastrophic fire, burning very hot and causing extensive damage to vegetation, soil, air, and water. Extremely hot fires burn all vegetation levels from grasses to tree canopy. Conifer canopies can burn so intensely that not even needle litter is left to protect scorched soil. Intense heat can pyrolize soil, causing it to become hydrophobic. Erosion increases dramatically when soils are both hydrophobic and exposed. These sediment causing conditions reduce soil fertility and restoration potential, cause direct water quality problems with suspended solids and sediment deposition, alter stream morphology, alter aquatic habitat, damage hydroelectric facilities, and reduce reservoir capacity.

The long term solution to this trend of increasing threat to water quality due to ecosystem imbalance from loss of natural fire cycle is challenging, to say the least. Will our culture choose to manage fire in this ecosystem with management zones separated with shaded fuel breaks and utilize controlled burn strategies? Will our choice be to mimic fire by managing the landscape by mechanical methods? Will we choose to use chemical or hand methods? Will we choose not to integrate the fire cycle but to mimic it? Or neither and choose to rely on suppression? Or do nothing?

The focus of this grant is to discover the implications of the shaded fuel break strategy on watershed and ecosystem values including water quality, as well as its socio-economic value. The dialogue that will be created by this project will occur amid the socio-political context described in question six, and will occur in the context of the Ecological Unit Inventory, the watershed planning approach, and the monitoring strategies noted in this proposal.

8. *Identify the NPS management measure(s) (see Section 6 of the ARD) that the proposed project will implement and describe how you will be able to track or account for the implementation of these measures.*

There is no existing specific non-point source pollution or water quality problem associated with excessive vegetation that threatens the City of Colfax. Management measures (ARD Section 6) 1A and 1G are relevant to this project proposal, as are 2a,b,e,f,g,h,j,k and l. Reduction in tons of fuel load per acre from 200± to 20 may expose soil to erosion by wind or water which could have an effect on existing water quality.

Individual landowners are responsible on a voluntary basis for implementing management measures specific to their parcels, respectively, following guidelines provided by ARD Section 6 and advice from project participants.

NPS management measures include prohibition of vegetative removal on excessive slopes and soil conditions that pose a threat of landslide or severe soil instability. Generally this would include unconsolidated Cenozoic or Mesozoic bedrock units and on hillsides exceeding 30 percent slope. A Registered Professional Forester shall be involved in the route planning and shall be onsite during the fuel break construction to ensure that preproject planning and deleterious and/or hazardous conditions are not present.and are created as a result of project implementation.

Maintain soil cover to reduce erosion potential during vegetative removal process. This will include chipping on site and or addition of rice straw prior to the rainy season as prescribed in the Placer County Erosion Control Ordinance or Erosion and Sediment Control Guidelines for Developing Areas of the Sierra Foothill and Mountains.
Identify and establish buffer zones along streams and watercourses and significant natural drainage features. The Registered Professional Forester will identify an appropriate width depending on slope, soil type, slope length of run, and vegetative type.
Prohibit use of heavy equipment within any watercourse and lake protection zone.
Avoid heavy equipment use on saturated or near-saturated soils.
Post project evaluation and education/outreach are addressed by American River Watershed Institute involvement.

9. *List the watershed group(s) of which the applicant is a member.*

The City of Colfax is a signatory to the MOU of the American River Watershed Group.

10. *Describe the level of local support for your project, including local government, tribal government, organized groups, landowners, agencies, and others working in the watershed. Also identify your relationship to other watershed or ecosystem projects and programs in your area.*

The proposed project originated in a joint meeting of the Greater Colfax Area Fire Safe Council and the Placer Hills Fire Safe Council. After discussion in the Council in the Fall of 2001, the project was brought before the Colfax City Council in study session, then at it's regular meeting where it was approved for submission in the pre-proposal process. In the unanimous vote to proceed to the full proposal stage, the City Council made several emphatic statements about the importance of moving into the future with a sound fire management and safety program and a network of shaded fuel breaks. The project was embraced by the American River Watershed Group as an element of its Watershed Stewardship Plan that is in process.
As noted above in question five, the issue of shaded fuel breaks and fire management has been integrated into the land use planning agenda of the Weimar-Applegate-Colfax Municipal Advisory Council (WACMAC). This community planning process will inject the issue directly into the Placer County General Plan process. The District 5 County Supervisor has stated that one of his expectations is a recommendation from the process of an approach to new development that will require through CC&R's fire safety and linkages to a network of shaded fuel breaks.
The importance of this grant is that it will bring the important issues of water quality, beneficial uses, watershed planning, and ecosystem analysis into the front-end planning processes, rather than addressing these concerns in the project implementation CEQA process after single purpose fire planning.

11. *Indicate if this project is implementing a proposed or existing*

The project is not implementing a proposed or existing TMDL.

12. *Summarize actions that have been accomplished to date to address the problem(s).*

In summer 2001, the Ponderosa Fire burned nearly 6000 acres in the American River Canyonland just southwest of Colfax. A shaded fuel break had been constructed on a private tree farm; CDF used that break as the basis for their fuel break extension that prevented the fire from advancing into the City of Colfax itself. The private fuel break is generally acknowledged as one of the most important factors that prevented catastrophic levels of damage to the City and to the extensive development along the urban-wildland interface.
But the fuel break was done only on the private tree farm as as private measure by the landowner to enhance the survivability of his forest, specifically. It was not part of an area wide plan. No monitoring for water quality, soil impacts, or habitat impacts were part of the project. The proposed pilot project in this grant will initiate an implementation project within multiple planning processes from city to county to fire safe council to watershed group.

13. *Describe related activities that have been completed to provide the reviewers with additional background information to understand and review the proposed project. These activities may include monitoring, watershed planning, water quality assessment, technology testing, and implementation projects.*

The City of Colfax is a recent member of the American River Watershed Group (ARWG). Activities through agencies involved with the larger group include defensible space, defensible landscaping and shaded fuel breaks related to projects implemented thorough Proposition 204. Area residents have participated in the County Fire Department chipper program and Coffee Klatches funded through Prop 204. Local residents are aware of existing Caltrans and CDF fuel reduction efforts along Interstate 80. Please reference question 13 for ARWG project grants.

14. *Have any previous Proposition 13 implementation grants or grants from other agencies and other funding sources (such as CALFED, CWA Section 319[h] or 205[j], Proposition 204) been awarded for work in this watershed.*

CalFed Category III: -Total Budget-$220,750
Start Date: May 1999

End Date: May 2002

Prop 204: Total Budget-$296,390
Start Date: June 1999
End Date: March 2002

Site Specific Objectives: Total Budget-$100,000
Start Date: June 1999
End Date: June 2002

1999 319-H: Total Budget-$250,000
Start Date: November 1999
End Date: June 2003

Department of Conservation: Total Budget- Truckee Watershed Coordinator $109,600
American River Coordinator $104,826
Start Date: March 2001
End Date: June 2002

EQIP: Total Budget-$5,600
Start Date: April 2001
End Date: September 2002

Ecologic Unit Inventory: Total Budget $554,500
Start Date: June 2001
End Date: June 2003

2002 319-H: Total Budget-$279,696
Start Date: June 2002
End Date: June 2005

15. Describe the financial/institutional capability or commitments that the applicant has to ensure that the project will be completed

The City of Colfax is the applicant and will comply with the state and federal standard terms associated with this grant. The City has experience in grant management and contract management to ensure that the project will be completed on time and within budget. This grant will assist the City in accomplishing portions of its adopted City General Plan and in particular goals and objectives contained within the Conservation/Open Space, Safety, and Land Use elements. Sub contractors associated with this grant include the American River Watershed Institute, which has demonstrated success in grant and contract management, is responsible for overseeing water quality QAPP and carrying out the educational components. Doug Ferrier, a registered professional forester, has established a local presence with the Placer County Resource Conservation District and is well known participant of the American River Watershed Program.

16. Is the project ready to proceed?

The proposed project funds an entire process, from planning to site selection to stakeholder concurrence, to specific landowner and construction mechanic agreements, to monitoring and evaluation, and to education and outreach. The project has become part of the Greater Colfax Area Fire Safe Council community planning process on the conceptual level. The concept of a network of shaded fuel breaks will continue to be discussed at this planning level; announcement of the receipt of this grant in fall 2002 will further catalyze planning even before the grant is contracted in summer 2003. The dialogue and discovery phase will continue through 2003 until winter 2004, when it is expected one of the several candidate neighborhoods will be selected for the pilot project. It is expected that the Ecological Unit Inventory will be completed by spring 2004 when the active planning phase for the selected neighborhood will begin. Site agreements will become part of the process in 2004. The construction phase of the project will occur in winter/spring/fall 2005, with monitoring and final report by spring of 2006.

17. Describe how the project will demonstrate a capability of sustaining water quality benefits for a period of 20 years as required by Proposition 13 (CWC Section 79080(f)).

As indicated in question seven, the project has near term and very long term implications. In the near term, we endeavor to learn the water quality implications of a shaded fuel break strategy, including both the construction methodologies, and the longer term implications of the managed fuel break lands. These construction and maintenance water quality issues need to be understood over time; a comprehensive shaded fuel break and defensible space fire safety community

plan will be doing the kind of work proposed in this project indefinitely. Incremental and cumulative effects need to be monitored and understood.

The longer term strategy is the key to sustaining water quality benefits, and the success of this pilot project will address those longer term benefits directly. If ecosystem equilibrium is not achieved, water quality will be at risk permanently. The fire cycle in the Sierra Nevada was frequent, and of moderate severity. We are learning that Native Americans managed the landscape with fire, increasing the natural frequency; it was a strategy that increased productivity and abundance of wildlife and the plant life on which they depended for survival. The strategy of western culture has been to suppress fire; this has pushed the fire cycle to extremes. Fires are now infrequent, and are now unnaturally supported by extreme fuel load conditions. Until as a culture we have addressed and adopted a strategy that is in harmony with the fire cycle, whether it is accommodating fire or mimicking fire, we will not have an assurance of sustainable water quality.

The question of how to live in safely within the Sierra Foothill ecosystem, which means accommodating the fire cycle of this ecosystem, extends well beyond 20 years, beyond human generational timeframes, and reaches out to the life cycles of the trees native to this area--- hundreds of years for oaks, pines, firs, many hundreds of years for sugar pine, and even thousands of years for the Sequoia. The project proposes to inject this dialogue into the planning processes underway.

18. If there is an NPDES permit required for this project area, describe the relationship of the project to the permit.

No NPDES permit will be required for this area.

19. *Indicate if the project will utilize the services of the California Conservation Corps, community conservation corps, or other local nonprofit entities employing underpriviledged youths (CWC Section 79085.*

Because the site and specific plan is developed by the proposal, it is not possible to determine the appropriate management practice at this time, hence it is not possible to pre-commit to CCC or other local NPO's like Placer Conservation Corps.

20. Will land, right of ways, or easements be purchased with Proposition 13 funds? Who will hold the title?

Lands will not be purchased, nor will easements or rights of way be purchased. The proposal team believes it is desirable to locate a community that is willing to make a permanent commitment to maintenance of the shaded fuel break. One of the mechanisms might be covenants in homeowner association agreements.

21. *Have adjacent landowners been notified of the project and the request for funding under this* program as required under Proposition 13 (CWC 79080 (h)(2) or Page 5 of the RFP)?

Because this project begins with a planning process that will identify location and sites later in the process, adjacency cannot be determined at this time. Task 5.3 specifically calls for contact with adjacent landowners as soon as a tentative project site has been determined.

PART E - Map (8½ x 11)

PART F – Environmental Information Form

NEPA/CEQA

1. Will this project require compliance with CEQA? Yes_**X CEQA**____No_____

2. If you checked "no" to question 1, please explain why compliance is not required for the actions in this proposal.

3. If the project will require CEQA and/or NEPA compliance, identify the lead agency(ies).

CEQA Lead Agency	City of Colfax
NEPA Lead Agency	

4. Please check which type of document will be prepared.

CEQA		**NEPA**	
Categorical Exemption		Categorical Exclusion	
Initial Study	Yes	Environmental Assessment/FONSI	
Environmental Impact Report		Environment Impact Statement	

If you anticipate relying on either or both the Categorical Exemption or Categorical Exclusion for this project, please specifically identify the exemption and/or exclusion that covers this project. (Example: Fish and Wildlife Service Manual at 516 DM 6 Appendix 1.4 Categorical Exclusions Section B Resources Management: (1) Research, inventory, and information collection activities directly related to the conservation of fish and wildlife resources.)

5. If the CEQA/NEPA process is not complete, please describe the estimated timelines and cost for the process and the expected date of completion.
As indicated in the timeline, project plan will be completed 4/30/04. After stakeholder concurrence processes, CEQA will be completed by 9/30/04

6. If the CEQA/NEPA document has been completed:

   What is the name of the document?_____N/A_____

   Please attach a copy of the CEQA/NEPA document cover page to the application.

7. Environmental Permitting and Approvals

Please indicate what permits or other approvals may be required for the activities contained in your proposal and which have already been obtained. Please check all that apply.

LOCAL PERMITS AND APPROVALS	Needed?	Obtained?
Conditional use permit	N/A	
Variance	N/A	
Subdivision Map Act	N/A	
Grading permit	N/A	
General plan or Local Coastal Program amendment	N/A	
Specific plan approval	N/A	
Rezone	N/A	
Williamson Act Contract cancellation	N/A	
Local Coastal Development Permit	N/A	
Other	N/A	
STATE PERMITS AND APPROVALS	Needed?	Obtained?
Scientific collecting permit	N/A	
CESA compliance: 2081	N/A	
CESA compliance: NCCP	N/A	
1601/03	N/A	
CWA 401 certification	N/A	
Coastal development permit	N/A	
Reclamation Board approval	N/A	
Notification of DPC or BCDC	N/A	

Other		
FEDERAL PERMITS AND APPROVALS	Needed?	Obtained?
ESA compliance Section 7 consultation	N/A	
ESA compliance Section 10 permit	N/A	
Rivers and Harbors Act	N/A	
CWA 404	N/A	
Other	N/A	
PERMISSION TO ACCESS PROPERTY		
Permission to access city, county or other local agency land. If "yes," indicate the name of the agency:_____ N/A _____	N/A	
Permission to access State land. If "yes," indicate the name of the agency: _____ N/A _____	N/A	
Permission to access federal land. If "yes," indicate the name of the agency: _____ N/A _____	N/A	
Permission to access private land. If "yes," indicate the name of the agency: ***will be obtained as per Task 5.7***	Yes	

PART G - LAND USE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do the actions in the proposal involve construction or physical changes in the land use?
   Yes____ No_X___

If you answered "yes" to # 1, describe what actions will occur on the land involved in the proposal.

If you answered "no" to # 1, explain what type of actions are involved in the proposal (i.e., research only, planning only). Fuel reduction and vegetation management

2. How many acres of land will be subject to a land use change under the proposal? ____none_

3. What is the current land use of the area subject to a land use change under the proposal? What is the current zoning and general plan designation(s) for the property? Does the current land use involve agricultural production?

a) Current land use rural residential, low density residential, ag or timber
b) Current zoning range 1.1 ac/DU to 80 acre minimum
c) Current general plan designation rural residential, low density residential, ag or timber
d) Does current use involve agricultural production? Yes_X____ No_____

4. Is the land subject to a land use change in the proposal currently under a Williamson Act contract?
   Yes_____ No___X__

5. What is the proposed land use of the area subject to a land use change under the proposal? N/A

6. Will the applicant acquire any land under the proposal, either in fee (purchase) or through a conservation easement?
   Yes_____ No__X___

a) If you answered "yes" to 6, describe the number of acres that will be acquired and whether the acquisition will be of fee title or a conservation easement:
b) Total number of acres to be acquired under proposal _____
c) Number of acres to be acquired in fee _____
d) Number of acres to be subject to conservation easement _____

7. For all lands subject to a land use change under the proposal, describe what entity or organization will manage the property and provide operations and maintenance services. N/A

8. Will the applicant require access across public or private property that the applicant does not own to accomplish the activities in the proposal? Yes__X___ No_____

9. For land acquisitions (fee title or easements), will existing water rights be acquired?
   Yes_____ No__X___

10. Does the applicant propose any modifications to the water right or change in the delivery of the water?
    Yes_____ No__X___

    If "yes" to 10, please describe the modifications or changes.

PART H – SUPPORTING RELEVANT DOCUMENTS (not to exceed 10 pages)